REMARKS

The specification is amended to correct the informalities mentioned in the first paragraph of the office action. The right parenthesis is added on page 10. The double arrow somehow printed on the copy made in place of the "τ" symbol. The "τ" symbol is added in place of these double arrows. Page 8 is also corrected to change "patch" to "path".

The informalities of Claim 9 are corrected by the amendments to Claim 9 to add the definitions to F_l, F_h, $F(k)$, $R(k)$, α and β.

Claims 1-3 are cancelled.

Claim 4 is put into independent form. Claim 4 is rejected under 3 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,285; hereinafter Anderson) in view of Krasny et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,408; hereinafter Krasny). The Krasny reference is not a valid reference since the filing date of the reference (November 22, 2000) was after the filing date of the present application on September 21, 2000 and the provisional application on October 22, 1999. In Anderson the detection decision at the frame level is based on power spectral features (see Anderson, Col. 7, lines 18-30, Col. 8, lines 20-21). In applicant's teaching the detection decision is made on the shape of autocorrelation function. Claim 4 is therefore deemed allowable over the references.

The examiner has indicated allowance of Claim 5 if put in independent form. Claim 5 is put in independent form. Claim 5 and dependent Claims 6 -9 are further deemed allowable as indicated by the examiner's remarks.

In view of the above applicant's Claims 4-9 are deemed in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance of these claims is deemed in order and is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Troike
Reg. 24,183
Tel. No. 301-259-2089